

## **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated April 4, 2008 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1, 3-7, 10, 12, 13 and 22 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Claims 23-25 are newly added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 3-7, 10, 12, 13, 16-18 and 22-25 are presently pending.

Claims 1, 3-7, 10, 12, 13 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for allegedly containing subject matter which was not disclosed in the specification as filed. In particular, the Office Action alleged that page 5 of the specification discloses that the timer used in the AAL-2 multiplexing unit has a larger value than the CU timer of the parallel data streams before the multiplexing unit. Furthermore, the claims were rejected because the claims recite that “the control unit used in the multiplexer has a larger value than a control unit timer of an asynchronous transfer mode adaptation layer 2 cell streams before said multiplexer. The Office action then proceeded to ask a question regarding the term “before” and how it is applied to being “before” the multiplexing unit.

In an effort to further prosecution and expedite an allowance of the present application, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 6, 7 and 22 to remove the term “before” so that claim 1, for example, now recites “wherein said asynchronous transfer mode switching unit comprises a multiplexer configured to multiplex said received

asynchronous transfer mode adaptation layer 2 cell streams into a single asynchronous transfer mode virtual connection to be processed by an asynchronous transfer mode switch, and wherein a control unit timer used in said multiplexer has a larger value than a control unit timer used for said asynchronous transfer mode adaptation layer 2 cell streams.”

Similar amendments were also made to independent claims 6, 7 and 22 to clarify the subject matter of those claims.

As for the term “before” which has been cancelled from the claim recitations, there is no need to include the word “before” because it is clear from the other features recited in the claims that the mapping of the call IDs into the AAL-2 cell streams must take place prior to the multiplexing of the AAL-2 cell streams into a single ATM virtual connection in the multiplexer. The order of operations is further clarified by the fact that the received AAL-2 streams are required to contain different call IDs which were mapped into them, and that the multiplexing is performed on the received AAL-2 cell streams. Therefore, the multiplexing of the AAL-2 cell streams must take place after the mapping of the call IDs into the AAL-2 cell streams.

As for the disclosure on page 5 of the specification which includes “the CU timer used in the AAL-2 multiplexing unit has a larger value than the CU time[r] of the parallel data streams before the multiplexing unit”, Applicants submit that the above-noted portion of the specification is directed to the portion of independent claims 1, 6, 7 and 22 which previously recited that “a control unit timer used in said multiplexer has a larger value than a control unit timer of said asynchronous transfer mode adaptation layer 2 cell streams before said multiplexer.” In other words, the “CU timer” is the same as a

“control unit timer”, as recited in the claims. The “AAL-2 multiplexing unit” of the specification corresponds to the “multiplexer” of the claims (see page 3, paragraph 4 of the specification). Furthermore, the “parallel data streams before the [AAL-2] multiplexing unit” of the specification corresponds to the “asynchronous transfer mode adaptation layer 2 cell streams” of the claims (see page 4, paragraph 1 of the specification). Therefore, all of the claims recitations are supported by the specification, and are thus in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of this rejection is kindly requested.

Claims 1, 3-7, 10, 12, 13 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for reasons similar to those described above with respect to the rejection under §112, first paragraph. As stated above, the term “before” has been removed from the claim recitations. All subject matter of the claims is supported by the specification in compliance with §112, first paragraph. Furthermore, all claim recitations are clear and unambiguous in compliance with §112, second paragraph. Withdrawal of all outstanding rejections and an allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention. These distinctions are more than sufficient to render the claimed invention unanticipated and unobvious. It is therefore respectfully requested that all of claims 1, 3-7, 10, 12, 13, 16-18 and 22-25 be allowed, and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by

telephone, the applicants' undersigned representative at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Kamran Emdadi  
Registration No. 58,823

**Customer No. 32294**  
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP  
14<sup>TH</sup> Floor  
8000 Towers Crescent Drive  
Vienna, Virginia 22182-6212  
Telephone: 703-720-7800  
Fax: 703-720-7802

KE/sjm:cqc